

### **REMARKS**

The Official Action dated 06 July 2004 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Avery et al (US 3,924,789).

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claim 2 would be allowable if written or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as set forth in this Office Action.

The Examiner has further kindly indicated that claims 3-5 would be allowable if written or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, claim 1 which has been rejected in view of the art has been cancelled, so that it is unnecessary to discuss the grounds of rejection specific thereto.

Claim 2 which is indicated to be allowable has been amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as set forth in this Office Action.

Claims 3 and 4 are dependent on the amended claim 2.

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 4.

Accordingly, claims 2-5 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner DURAND are appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.